



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

08/158031

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/158,031 11/26/93 FILEPP

R PRD006

FEILD, EXAMINER
-----------------

24M1/0822

PAUL C. SCIFO  
233 BROADWAY, SUITE 4703  
NEW YORK, NY 10279

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2412

12

DATE MAILED:

08/22/96

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*See Attached*

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

RECEIVED

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/158,031**

Applicant(s)  
**FILEPP ET AL**

Examiner  
**Joseph H. Feild**

Group Art Unit  
**2412**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph H. Feild (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Paul Scifo (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 21, 1996

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Windows 2.0

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued extensively, contrasting the instant invention versus the prior art. Applicant directed the examiner's attention toward the specification in support of the claim language. The examiner held that much of what applicant argued was not expressly drafted in the claim language. Applicant argued that claims must be evaluated in light of the specification. Applicant agreed to amend claim 1 as follows: (1) add language to clarify that the "information elements" are actually "objects" (the "objects" are described extensively in the specification and illustrated in figs. 4a-4c) and (2) add language to clarify that the objects used to build the partitions can be stored either only locally, only remotely (on the network), or both locally and remotely. The examiner agreed that such language, if properly phrased, would obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Windows 2.0. Box AF to follow.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

*Joseph H. Feild*  
**JOSEPH H. FEILD**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2412**